Objectionable Reference made by a Member *re* : Fast undertaken by the Opposition Members.

MR. SPEAKER.- Sri K. Lakkappa, the Hon'ble Member, was pleased to raise an objection with regard to certain observations that were made by the Hon'ble Member Sri S. S. Kolkebail. I have perused the papers. Does he want to say anything with regard to that ? He says : ನಿನ್ನೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಅನ್ನ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹವನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಉಪವಾಸ ಎಂದು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಮುಸ್ಲಿಮರ ರಂಜಾನ್ ಉಪವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಲಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

I have got the extract ready :

"The increase in land assessment will affect 80 per-cent of the population and therefore sufficient safeguards must be provided, to protect their interests. Even from the point of my party, I must say that it is the villagers who support the Congress Party. I am proud to say that. We must be honest in our sayings and doings. When we do anything, we do it from the election point of view. We have to look at these things also from the political point of view. The Opposition is staging a fast. It is just like the fast undertaken by the Mohemadans during Ramzan times. They take food at night and fast during day time. Our opposition members fasting can be compared to that Ramzan Fast. It is not a fast in the real sense. It is for political purpose and not really to help the ryots. They are least bothered about the ryots. Congress members are also equally interested in this matter. The Chief Minister or the Revenue Minister is interested in seeing that there should be some relief."

Will the member seriously maintain that there is anything seriously wrong in it ? If the Members want time, I will give them time to explain this.

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL (Coondapoor).—On a point of order, Sir, The point of order is, the particular passage to which the Hon'ble Member Sri K. Lakkappa has raised objection against what was spoken by me in the course of the debate when the Hon'ble Deputy Speaker was presiding over this House. The Deputy Speaker was the sole monarch of the House at that time. I contend that the Speaker is not an appellate authority in the sense that the High Court or the Supreme Court is. At this stage, I do not think the Hon'ble Member can raise this before the Speaker. That is my submission and I request the Speaker that he may be pleased to rule it out of order.

MR. SPEAKER.—Would the Hon'ble Member Sri S. S. Kolkebail enlighten me whether the point of order was raised and a ruling given by the Deputy Speaker at that time ? He has referred to my absence and my consequential incompetence to entertain this point here.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—Mr. Speaker, we are governed by certain rules which this House has framed. Under the rules 10, 11, powers of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of the meeting, they are co-existent with the powers of the Speaker. So that when the Deputy Speaker is presiding over the House, he is the sole monarch of the House. The Deputy Speaker is not subordinate to the Speaker. I am not questioning your authority. I only submit that when the Deputy Speaker is presiding, he is the sole monarch and when an objection was not raised at that time, it cannot be agitated again by way of an appeal or revision as is done in the case of judicial matters. There is no reason for this particular objection to be raised by my Hon'ble friend Sri Lakkappa and it has to be rejected *in limine*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member is blowing hot and cold. He is not only blowing hot and cold, he is also trumpetting. I ask the Hon'ble Member whether the Deputy Speaker has given any ruling. If he has given a ruling, then it is binding on the House and equally binding on me. But if the point has not been raised, whether he has got any authority to raise it now unless at that time the point has been raised and a ruling has been given, whatever be the correctness or otherwise, whatever may be the feeling, about the matter, I am not competent, and I am not able to entertain any application. But so far as I have seen, I do not see any objection was raised by anybody and consequently there could be no ruling. Unless I come to the conclusion that delay is a dangerous bar to this. I do not see, how I cannot entertain. I have to entertain–I may reject it, but that does not mean that I have no right to entertain it.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—My objection goes to the very root of the particular motion raised by my friend Sri Lakkappa-in the nature of a revision or appeal before the Speaker, when a particular officer was presiding. If the Speaker thinks that he has the power as an appellate authority, then I have no objection for your entertaining it. But so far as I understand the Rules, I have read the entire book-there is absolutely no rule which empowers my friend to raise this point before the Speaker and for the Speaker to hear it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Would the Hon'ble Member study it further? I am prepared to adjourn this matter. Otherwise, I will give my ruling.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—I know the parliamentary practice right from 1932. I was a Member of the Assembly right from 1932.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—He probably wants to say that there is nothing for him to study any further.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So, the Member has attained maturity. I want to know whether there are any precedents up till now-whether a proposition like this has been allowed. That a point of order should be raised immediately it occurs is no doubt correct. But it does not mean of course, that if the Deputy speaker was presiding at that time and a few

minutes later the Speaker comes, the presiding officer at the time being the Deputy Speaker, the Speaker is prevented from entertaining the application or request or if a point raised saying that there has been a breach of privilege. In the case of a privilege motion, the point should be raised immediately if possible. But certainly delay is not dangerous. The question may be raised and I may reject it. But the question of an appeal against the order of the Deputy Speaker or a person jumps to the conclusion that there is an appellate tribunal in the shape of a Speaker.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—The Speaker seems to be thinking that I am questioning his authority. With all respect to the Speaker, I wish to mention that the Deputy Speaker was in charge of the House at that time, and nobody took objection. If there was any point of privilege, it should have been raised then and there. If it could not be raised at that time, it cannot be agitated again before the House by means of an appeal just like an appellate authority. If the Speaker thinks that he is an appellate authority over the Deputy Speaker and that the Deputy Speaker is subordinate to him, then I have no argument.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The last part is best said ! ... part that he has no argument. But *Prima facie* I may say I am not prepared to entertain it. But if it is a question of basically sound reasoning, if anybody wants to say, wants to quote precedents, I would be very happy.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—One thing Sir. In regard to precedents, hereafter we shall not quote precedents from foreign countries. Let us consider precedents in this very House itself, when the Hon'ble Mr. Kanthi was the presiding officer and afterwards you have taken over.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will bear that in mind.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಶ್ರೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸೋಣ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಹಲವಾರು ಕಾರಣಗಳಿವೆ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I said, I am not hearing anybody today. ನಾನು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ತಯಾರಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಕಾರಣ ಹೇಳುವ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಓದಿನೋಡಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಇಚ್ಛೆ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು, ನಾಳೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು, ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರು ನಾಡಿದ್ದು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. I will hear it day after-tomorrow. So you will have two day's time.

Before of proceed with the work, there is another delicate duty to perform. I find that with regard to questions, answers that have been submitted are exhausted. This is the position. Questions admitted and sent to Government 853. Replies have been received so far to 508 questions. Number of questions answered on the Floor of the House is 477. Replies on hand are for 10 plus 4 plus 17 Questions. Out of these 10 replies pertain to members who are under detention. Four replies of

(MR. SPEAKER)

similar questions have already been answered. These have been kept back and there is no point in engaging the House on the same points. Questions for which replies are ripe but still due are 277. Questions for which replies are not ripe 62. Questions for which extension of time has been requisitioned for 108. Number of lists printed and ready-Nil. Number of lists sent to the Press-Nil. Something must be done. It is rather unfortunate. If replies are received hereafter, we have to send it to the Press for printing after getting them translated all this amounts to much work, I would seriously suggest one or two members may meet me during tea-break.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—We will try to expedite.

Mr. SPEAKER.—One or two of you may kindly meet me along with one or two members of the Opposition.

(*Sri V. S. Patil stood up*).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have the file ready. Sri V. S. Patil may kindly come and meet me.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ (ಗುಂಡ್ಲುಪೇಟೆ).—ಎರಡು ಅಧಿವೇಶನಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಐದು ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ಮುಗಿದುಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಬರೆದು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ.—ನನ್ನ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will look into it between 3 P.M. and 3-30 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಳಗೊಳ).—ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How will it improve the position beyond what I said ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದಲ್ಲ, ಎರಡಲ್ಲ, ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಸಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

Mr SPEAKER.—Why can't the members have patience till 3 P.M. or 3-30 P.M. ?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Several times, you have invited us and you have also warned them ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಲವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುವಾಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.....

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—For inconvenient questions, they simply want time.